

## **REMARKS**

As an initial matter, Applicant notes with appreciation the Examiner's indication that Claims 17-32, 56-59, 69-74, 82-84 are allowed, and Claims 2-3, 7-16, 34, 36-37, 39-47, 60-67 and 75-79 are directed to allowable subject matter.

In paragraphs 2-3 of the present Office Action, Claims 1 and 33 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, as lacking antecedent basis for the recitation "the memory" in Claims 1 and 33. That rejection is respectfully traversed as applied to Claim 1 because Claim 1 does not recite "the memory." In the present Amendment, Applicant has, however, amended Claim 1 to rewrite "the memory" as "the logic DUT." In view of this amendment, Applicant believes that the rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, is overcome.

Next, in paragraphs 4-5 of the present Office Action, a provisional double patenting rejection is made as to Claims 1, 4-6, 33, 35, 38, 68 and 76 in view of copending U.S. Patent Applicant Serial No. 10/130,842. Applicant will file a terminal disclaimer to obviate this rejection upon allowance of the present Application.

Finally, in paragraph 7 of the present Office Action, Claims 1, 4 and 33 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 6,218,910 to *Miller*. That rejection is respectfully traversed as it might be applied to the claims as amended herein, and favorable reconsideration of the claims is respectfully requested.

With respect to exemplary Claim 1, Applicant respectfully traverses the rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) because *Miller* does not teach or suggest each claim feature. For example, *Miller* does not teach or suggest "tester logic ... that, responsive to receipt of a first command from the at least one die signifying a read access, supplies requested data to the at least one die via the wafer probe card, and responsive to receipt of a second command from the at least one die signifying a write access, stores associated data received from the at least one die in a memory," as recited in exemplary Claim 1. That is, *Miller* does not teach or suggest testing a

device under test utilizing tester logic that, for purposes of the test, permits the device under test to operate as the master device controlling read and write access.

With respect to the claimed tester logic, page 4 of the present Office Action cites *Miller's* test head 20, which is illustrated in *Miller's* Figure 1 and described, *inter alia*, at col. 4, lines 24-40. The cited passage (and the remainder of *Miller*) does not teach or suggest tester logic that permits the device under test to operate as the master device during testing as claimed. Consequently, Applicant submits that the rejections of Claim 1, similar Claims 33 and 35 and their respective dependent claims are overcome.

Moreover, Applicant believes that *Miller* does not render the present claims unpatentable because *Miller* does not teach or suggest “the connections of the wafer probe card present an impedance selected to emulate the characteristic impedance of an end-use environment for a packaged device containing the at least one die,” as recited in exemplary Claim 1. With respect to this feature, the present Office Action cites a number of passages from *Miller* that disclose the tuning of the resistive and capacitive impedances to optimize the channel frequency response of a tester probe card. However, *Miller* nowhere teaches or suggests that the channel have the characteristic impedance “of an end-use environment for a packaged device containing the at least one die” (emphasis supplied).

Because *Miller* does not teach or suggest that “the connections of the wafer probe card present an impedance selected to emulate the characteristic impedance of an end-use environment for a packaged device containing the at least one die,” as recited in exemplary Claim 1, Applicant respectfully submits that the rejection of exemplary Claim 1, similar Claims 33 and 35 and their respective dependent claims under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) is overcome.

Having now responded to each objection and rejection set forth in the present Office Action, Applicant believes all pending claims are now in condition for allowance and respectfully requests such allowance.

Enclosed is a check in the amount of \$210.00 for a two-month extension of time. No additional fee or extension of time is believed to be required.

Respectfully submitted,

A handwritten signature in cursive script, reading "Brian F. Russell", is written over a horizontal line.

Brian F. Russell

*Registration No. 40,796*

DILLON & YUDELL LLP

P.O. Box 201720

Austin, Texas 78720-1720

(512) 343-6116

ATTORNEY FOR APPLICANT